UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE			UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/873,601	06/12/1997	GARRY P. NOLAN	A-63915/DJB/	2070
24353 7590 10/07/2003			EXAMINER	
	FIELD & FRANCIS LI	WESSENDORF, TERESA D		
200 MIDDLEFIELD RD SUITE 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			1639	18
			DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003	39

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
			NOLAN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	08/873,601 Examiner	Art Unit			
	y	T. D. Wessendorf	1639			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a					
Period fo		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat aply received by the Office later than three months after the maid d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	J. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (: od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN	ly be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	<u>5 June 2003</u> .				
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.				
3) <mark>∏</mark> Dispositie	Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>58-83</u> is/are pending in the applica	ition.				
4	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)🖂	Claim(s) 58-83 are subject to restriction and	/or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
ר 🗌 (11	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) dis	approved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
ר(12	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[] All b) [] Some * c) [] None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the paper application from the International tee the attached detailed Office action for a l	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dome					
а) The translation of the foreign language in the foreign language in the second secon	provisional application has bee	en received.			
Attachment	-	p, 220, 00 0.0,0, 3				
1) 🗌 Notic 2) 🛄 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of Inf	immary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

•

-

-

DETAILED ACTION

As a preliminary matter, in the amendment of 6/25/03 a request was made to amend claim 1. However, claim 1 has been cancelled. It is not clear whether applicants are referring to pending claim 58.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 58, 60-76 and 79, drawn to a method of screening a plurality of cells comprising introducing a plurality of a library of nucleic acids.
- II. Claims 59, 77, and 78, drawn to a method of screening using a bioactive agent precursor.
- III. Claim 80, 60-76 and 79 drawn to a method of screening
 with a retroviral vector.
- IV. New claims 81 and 83, drawn to a method of screening an enzymatic complex.
- V. New claim 82, drawn to a method of screening an enzymatic complex with a bioactive agent precursor. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are drawn to different methods with different modes of operation employing different components.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and the search required for Group I is not required for Groups II-V, specifically with respect to the literature searches, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A). Species of scaffold fusion partners:

- 1. Targeting sequence, claim 65
- 2. Rescue sequence, claim 66
- 3. Stability sequence, claim 67

B). Species of Enzyme fusion partners:

1. Targeting sequence, claim 68

2. Rescue sequence, claim 69

3. Stability sequence, claim 70

Each of the species in each of the subgroups A and B differs with respect to the property fusion partner supplied to the scaffold. A prior art reference anticipating one of the species in e.g., Group A would not render obvious the other species.

A proper election of species requires a selection from each of subgroups A and B. The species would be examined together with the group applicants would elect.

[Note this species restriction requirement was made in the Office action of 3/24/99 and applicants' election (response) to said restriction of 5/10/99. The response elected the targeting species and rescue sequences. Applicants re-introduced the non-elected species in the Amendment of 5/16/01. The examiner's inadvertent inclusion of the non-elected species in the Office action of 7/26/01 and 6/17/02 is regretted. Since the species are still included in the present amendment, hence, the species restriction of 3/24/99 is reiterated and applied herein].

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 58 and 80 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected

consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be

examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

[In response to this Office action, applicants are requested to provide information on all copending applications and/or issued patent related or claim priority from the instant application].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. D. Wessendorf whose telephone number is (703) 308-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexitime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on (703) 306-3217. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

1

T. D. Wessendorf Primary Examiner Art Unit 1639

Tdw October 6, 2003